

Appl. No. 09/941,142
Amdt. dated February 4, 2008
Reply to Final Office Action of December 14, 2007

**AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE
REMARKS**

Claims 21 to 58 were pending in the application at the time of examination. Claims 42 and 56 to 58 stand rejected as anticipated. Claims 21 to 56 and 58 stand rejected as obvious.

Applicants have moved the limitation of Claim 24 into Claim 21 and cancelled Claim 24. In addition, Claim 21 is amended for consistency with the incorporation of Claim 24. The amendment is supported at least by pg. 15, lines 7 to 13 of the specification as filed.

Applicants have moved the limitation of Claim 36 into Claim 32 and cancelled Claim 36. In addition, Claim 32 is amended for consistency with the incorporation of Claim 36. The amendment is supported at least by pg. 15, lines 7 to 13 of the specification as filed.

Claim 33 is amended for consistency with Claim 32.

Claims 42 and 56 are amended for consistency with Claims 1 and 32.

Claim 57 is amended for consistency with Claim 56.

Applicants have moved the limitation of Claim 48 into Claim 45 and cancelled Claim 48. In addition, Claim 45 is amended for consistency with the incorporation of Claim 48. The amendment is supported at least by pg. 15, lines 7 to 13 of the specification as filed.

Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments to the claims to place the application in condition for allowance in view of the following remarks. If the Examiner should disagree entry is requested to further narrow the issues for appeal.

Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment should not require consideration of new issues or a new search, because a dependent claim is being moved into an independent claim and the further definition of the recited entry should be reasonably expected. The MPEP provides "The search should

Appl. No. 09/941,142
Amdt. dated February 4, 2008
Reply to Final Office Action of December 14, 2007

AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

cover the claimed subject matter and should also cover the disclosed features which might reasonably be expected to be claimed." MPEP § 904.01(b), 8th Ed., Rev. 6, pg. 900-48 (August 2006). Accordingly, the features added should fall within the scope of the existing search and the features more clearly define the invention.

Claims 42 and 56 to 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,420,991, hereinafter referred to as Konigsfeld.

Applicants respectfully traverse the anticipation rejection of Claim 42 in view of Konigsfeld. The rationale for continuing the rejection asserts "It doesn't matter what buffer is checked. As long as some entry associated with the load is checked as is the case with Konigsfeld, the claim language has been anticipated." This is error, because the claim limits the invention to a specific buffer. Moreover, Konigsfeld fails to teach or suggest the specific field that is checked as recited in Claim 42. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 42 in view of Konigsfeld.

With respect to the anticipation rejection of Claim 56 in view of Konigsfeld, the comments with respect to Claim 42 are applicable because the buffer recited is the "load buffer for said load operation." Also, Konigsfeld fails to teach or suggest the specific field that is checked as recited in Claim 56. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of Claim 56 in view of Konigsfeld.

Claims 57 and 58 depend from Claim 56 and so distinguish over Konigsfeld for at least the same reasons as Claim 56. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the anticipation rejection of each of Claims 57 and 58 in view of Konigsfeld.

GUNNISON, MCKAY &
HODGSON, LLP.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Cordova Road, Suite 220
Menlo Park, CA 94025
(650) 655-0880
Fax (650) 655-0770

Appl. No. 09/941,142
Amdt. dated February 4, 2008
Reply to Final Office Action of December 14, 2007

AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Claims 21 to 56 and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 5,168,564, hereinafter referred to as Barlow, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,613,083, hereinafter referred to as Glew.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 21, 32, 42, 45, and 56. Assuming arguendo the combination of references is correct, the age of Glew teaches away from the read-after-write hazard field as defined in each of these claims and so the combination fails to suggest or disclose the inventions recited in these claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 21, 32, 42, 45 and 56 in view of Barlow and Glew.

Claims 22, 23 and 25 to 31 depend from Claim 21 and so distinguish over Barlow and Glew for at least the same reasons as Claim 21. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 22, 23 and 25 to 31 in view of Barlow and Glew.

Claims 33 to 35 and 37 to 41 depend from Claim 32 and so distinguish over Barlow and Glew for at least the same reasons as Claim 32. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 33 to 35 and 37 to 41 in view of Barlow and Glew.

Claims 46, 47 and 49 to 55 depend from Claim 45 and so distinguish over Barlow and Glew for at least the same reasons as Claim 45. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 46, 47 and 49 to 55 in view of Barlow and Glew.

Claims 43 and 44 depend from Claim 42 and so distinguish over Barlow and Glew for at least the same reasons as Claim 42. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 43 and 44 in view of Barlow and Glew.

GUNNISON, MCKAY &
HODGSON, LLP.
Garden West Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Menlo Park, CA 94025
(415) 323-0880
Fax (415) 655-0888

Appl. No. 09/941,142
Amdt. dated February 4, 2008
Reply to Final Office Action of December 14, 2007

AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Claim 58 depends from Claim 56 and so distinguishes over Barlow and Glew for at least the same reasons as Claim 56. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 58 in view of Barlow and Glew.

Claims 21, 22, 25 to 27, 29, 32 to 34, 37 to 39, 45 to 46 and 49 to 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,141,734, hereinafter referred to as Razdan, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,613,083, hereinafter referred to as Glew.

Applicants respectfully traverse the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 21, 32, and 45. Assuming *arguendo* the combination of references is correct, the age of Glew teaches away from the read-after-write hazard field as defined in each of these claims and so the combination fails to suggest or disclose the inventions recited in these claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 21, 32, and 45 in view of Razdan and Glew.

Claims 22, 25 to 27 and 29 depend from Claim 21 and so distinguish over Razdan and Glew for at least the same reasons as Claim 21. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 22, 25 to 27 and 29 in view of Razdan and Glew.

Claims 33, 34 and 37 to 39 depend from Claim 32 and so distinguish over Razdan and Glew for at least the same reasons as Claim 32. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 33, 34 and 37 to 39 in view of Razdan and Glew.

Claims 46 and 49 to 51 depend from Claim 45 and so distinguish over Razdan and Glew for at least the same reasons as Claim 45. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of each of Claims 46 and 49 to 51 in view of Razdan and Glew.

GUNNISON, MCKAY &
HODGSON, LLP
Garden Wood Office Plaza
1900 Garden Road, Suite 220
Menlo Park, CA 94025
(415) 655-0880
Fax (415) 655-0880

Appl. No. 09/941,142
Amdt. dated February 4, 2008
Reply to Final Office Action of December 14, 2007

AFTER FINAL EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Claims 21 to 23, 25 to 35, 37 to 47 and 49 to 58 remain in the application. Claims 21, 32, 33, 42, 45, 56 and 57 have been amended. Claims 24, 36 and 48 are cancelled. Claims 1 to 20 were canceled previously. For the foregoing reasons, Applicant(s) respectfully request allowance of all pending claims. If the Examiner has any questions relating to the above, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned Attorney for Applicant(s).

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, Fax No. (571) 273-8300, on

February 4, 2008.

Mona Marshall February 4, 2008
Mona Marshall Date of Signature

Respectfully submitted,



Forrest Gunnison
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32,899